

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are submitted under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 in response to the Final Official Action of the Examiner mailed February 2, 2004. Having addressed all objections and grounds of rejection, claims 1-20, being all the pending claims, are now deemed in condition for allowance. Entry of these amendments and reconsideration to that end is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,070,150, issued to Remington et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Remington"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed as to the amended claims for the following reasons.

In response to this rejection, Applicant has herewith amended claims 1-2, 6, 11 and 16 to limit all pending claims to generation of the report at a particular date and delivery of the report to any particular user in response to user terminal log-on. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the specification and at page 9, lines 7-16, and page 32, in particular.

These amendments are deemed to particularly distinguish over Remington. Therefore, independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16, being all independent claims, are each deemed patentable over Remington. Applicant's arguments with regard to the unique limitations of the

dependent claims have been previously made and are of record herein.

The Examiner has maintained his rejection of claims 5, 15 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Remington in view of Applicant's Background of the Invention. It has been previously point out to the Examiner that Applicant's Background of the Invention specifically explains why the alleged combination would not be motivated. In response thereto, the Examiner states:

However, the examiner believes that the Classic MAPPER database management system that was available at the time of the invention was not saddled with these limitations. In support, the examiner submits descriptions of the MAPPER system that were posted on the Unisys web site as of 26 May 1997. The system is characterized as "an open, enterprise-wide, client/server environment". This is in stark contrast with the limited proprietary system that is portrayed in the Applicant's argument. (Emphasis added)

The Examiner says he believes that MAPPER was not saddled with these limitations. Yet, in support of this belief he cites "an open, enterprise-wide, client/server environment". His citation does not directly support his belief. Therefore, it is assumed that the Examiner has found motivation for the alleged combination without adequate support. The rejection of claims 5, 15, and 19-20 is respectfully traversed.


Having thus responded to each objection and ground of rejection, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and allowance of claims 1-20, as amended, being the only pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Seongho Bae

By his attorney,

Date April 2, 2004



Lawrence M. Nawrocki
Reg. No. 29,333
Suite 401
Broadway Place East
3433 Broadway Street N.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota
55413
(612) 331-1464